

S/N: 10/541,175

Page 6 of 7

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 2, 13 and 14 have been amended. Claim 15 has been added. Claims 1-15 are pending. The revisions to claims 1 and 2 are supported at page 10, lines 8-23. Claim 13 has been amended to track the previous revisions to claim 8. Claim 14 has been amended to require the presence of cerium oxide. New claim 15 is supported for example at page 11, lines 19-20.

The objection to claim 13 has been overcome by the above revisions.

Claims 1-7 and 9-12 have been rejected as unpatentable over Hashimoto. Favorable reconsideration of this rejection is requested. The rejection contends that the reference composition overlaps that of claim 1. However, as noted in the rejection, the reference discloses 5-15% TiO_2 as its preferable composition at col. 6, lines 55-57, while independent claim 1 requires a minimum of 20%. In addition, while the preferable composition of the reference includes Na_2O in the amount of 5-22%, the 99 examples use amounts of 0 to 18%. In contrast, claim 1 requires a minimum of 20% Na_2O . Nothing in the reference suggests any reason for modifying the amounts of the components to meet those required by claim 1. This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 13 and 14 have been rejected as unpatentable over Zou. Favorable reconsideration of this rejection is requested. The rejection contends that Zou discloses a composition overlapping that of claim 8, relying on the embodiment discussed at col. 5, lines 10-25. However, line 17 of col. 5 indicates that the $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3/\text{MgO}$ ratio is less than 0.5. In contrast, claim 8 requires a minimum Al_2O_3 content of 15% and a maximum MgO content of 25%. Therefore the smallest $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3/\text{MgO}$ ratio within the scope of claim 8 is 0.6, which is significantly about the maximum ratio permitted by the reference embodiment used to support the rejection. Therefore, this rejection also should be withdrawn.

S/N: 10/541,175


Page 7 of 7

In view of the above, Applicants request reconsideration of the application in the form of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN,
MUELLER & LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
Phone: 612-455-3800

Date: September 17, 2009

By 
Name: Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
DPM/mz
Customer No. 52835